

## REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated September 13, 2004. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

### Status of the Claims

Claims 2-6 are under consideration in this application. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are being amended, as set forth above and in the attached marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

### Additional Amendments

The specification and the claims are being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better disclose or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

### Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 1 claims 2-6 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-19 of US Patent No. 6,636,926. Although the claims are not exactly identical, the Examiner considered the claims not patentably distinct from claims 1-19 of the '926 patent.

A terminal disclaimer is being submitted concurrently according to the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding double patenting rejection is in order, and is respectfully solicited.

### Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot

anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**October 29, 2004**

SPF/JCM/JT